



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/757,312	01/14/2004	Gregory J. Engel		3528

7590 11/15/2004
Michael B. Lasky
Altera Law Group
Suite 100
6500 City West Parkway
Minneapolis, MN 55344-7704

EXAMINER

SNIDER, THERESA T

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

1744

DATE MAILED: 11/15/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

10/757,312

Applicant(s)

ENGEL ET AL. *TA*

Examiner

Theresa T. Snider

Art Unit

1744

All Participants:

(1) Theresa T. Snider.

(2) Michael Lasky.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 10 November 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

N/A

Claims discussed:

N/A

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:
See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Theresa T. Snider
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner confirmed with Mr. Lasky that even though the cover sheet(PTO-326) of the Final Rejection of 5/28/2004 stated the rejection was a non-final rejection, it should be considered and treated as a FINAL rejection because it was stated to be a final rejection in the last paragraph of the rejection.